

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/542,932

Applicant(s)

SHIRAI, SADANOBU

Examiner

MELISSA S. MERCIER

Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MELISSA S. MERCIER

(3) Amy Schmid

(2) Bob Wax

(4) N/A

Date of Interview: 1-12-11

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: example of device

Claim(s) discussed: claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Money

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: N/A

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Ms. Schmid discussed the lack of a teaching of the thickness of the support layer, and the requirement of additional layers within the device of money. The Examiner will reconsider the rejection "as a whole".

[Signature]